

Meeting Summary

Salmon Recovery Funding Board Issues Task Force

July 31, 2003, 10 am – 5:30 pm and August 1, 2003, 8 am - 2 pm
SeaTac, WA

Members Present:

Steve Tharinger, Chair; Shirley Solomon; Craig Partridge (7/31 only); Doug St. John; Julie Dagnon; Laura Johnson; Jeff Breckel; Jim Kramer; Steve Martin; Tim Smith; Jim Fox.

Also present: Brian Walsh; Teresa Scott; Rollie Geppert; Kristi Silver; and SRFB project managers Galuska, Ramsey, Abbott, McIntosh & Duboiski, for presentations on 7/31 p.m.

5th Round Schedule:

Following introductions and a brief review of the ITF's last meeting, the ITF reviewed a draft time schedule for 5th Round grants.

Participants noted that the draft timeline (commencing in January, 2004, applications due in July and SRFB decision in early December) reflects what was generally agreed to and announced at the July SRFB meeting; will need to have more discussion about specific calendar dates at later meeting. Concerns for fine-tuning the schedule included:

- Coordination with other schedule demands, including preparation of local strategies and subbasin and regional plans, and state budget preparation.
- Schedule for Technical Panel interaction with lead entities.

Action Conclusion by ITF: SRFB to post recap of 5th Round schedule and reasons for adjustments, per July meeting decisions; and, request comments from LEs and other interested parties, so ITF can review at its next meeting.

NFWF Small Grants Proposal:

Krystnya Wolniakowski of the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation's (NFWF) explained their proposal to expand Community Salmon Fund "small" grant program (under \$50,000) to additional local partners in the Puget Sound area, with assistance from SRFB matching funds. Extended conversation ensued concerning issues such as how to ensure coordination with local processes; role of LEs and strategies; who would be likely potential partners; what the need is for "small" grants, etc. Steve Tharinger thanked NFWF for the overview, and asked ITF members to consider this on the following day.

Issues Workgroups:

SRFB project managers gave a brief overview of the 'issues workgroups' formed early in the year and facilitated by SRFB staff. Rollie Geppert introduced the

presentations, explaining that the workgroups started before the ITF, and most are a work-in-progress, with materials to be reviewed with the ITF before SRFB action later in fall 2003. Workgroups' main tasks were to review issues regarding project eligibility, and clarifying definitions of *benefit* and *certainity* (B&C) for different project types.

Assessments (reported by Tara Galuska): Reviewed workgroup suggestions for revisions to B&C definitions to better fit assessment projects. ITF comments included inquiries about how the GSRO Assessment Guidance is used; how SRFB-funded assessments fit with other assessments in watershed, and how to ensure that SRFB and locals get value from the assessment.

Nearshore projects (reported by Mike Ramsey): Workgroup reviewed the PSNRP's 14 primary questions for possible integration into application forms; noted that nearshore assessments should employ consistent methodologies; B&C definitions are still being addressed by workgroup. ITF comments and questions included need to ensure relation to recovery plans; workgroup need to work with PSNRP; process for soliciting future nearshore applications; need to ensure that review criteria and process works for all estuaries in the state.

Fish Passage (reported by Brian Abbott): This workgroup noted that the science of barrier removals is well understood; main need is to proceed to address the many passage blockages. ITF comments and questions: Workgroup needs to provide recommendations concerning eligibility of timberland projects; better linkage to other passage efforts such as DOT's fish passage mitigation list; more work on clarifying the problem being addressed by the workgroup.

Acquisition Projects (reported by Marc Duboiski): Workgroup primarily addressed clarification of B&C for land purchases; reach-level criteria; and how to measure other protective measures. ITF comments and questions: noted that acquisition can be locally sensitive – possible methods to address include agreement by local leaders; how to address maintenance and land stewardship; need to focus on land's function in relation to regulatory or protective opportunities.

Restoration projects' B& C (reported by Barb McIntosh): Brief overview provided, awaiting work of other groups in order to make definitions of B&C for different project types consistent. ITF comments and questions: Would like additional clarification, how to address preference for listed species. Also discussed methods to address cost-effectiveness in criteria.

Forest & Fish-related projects (reported by Rollie Geppert): Workgroup is in the process of designing a new grant program and will bring a proposal to the SRFB in September. ITF comments and questions included: involvement of lead entities and strategies; how to allow for counties with better barrier inventories.

Action Conclusions by ITF, Workgroups' presentations: Continue work, help address questions raised. Many of these 5th Round issues will be addressed by the ITF later this fall.

Lead Entity Strategies:

Teresa Scott presented an overall vision of salmon recovery planning (based on May LE workshop presentation). Showed what a recovery plan's components are and how a lead entity strategy is part of those components. ITF comments and questions:

- Presentation is an excellent context for the LE strategies
- How to encourage LEs to be able to contribute most effectively to overall vision of recovery planning
- How best to do "strategy" before recovery plans are complete
- Many pathways possible to get to the recovery goal; communities have to be engaged
- Concern that we not overwhelm LEs with fewer resources; plans can be costly in time and people
- Getting increasing sophistication of local and regional strategies
- Need to see how strategies will be used, in context of SRFB grants and grant reviews
- Extended conversation about important inclusion of non-science issues, variously called 'socio-political,' 'socio-economic' or 'community'. Needed to be sure community and key decision makers are engaged in decision, adjust local science ranking process. Need for SRFB to clarify what it will use/accept for 'socio-economic' elements of local strategies.

The ITF recessed for the evening around 5:30 pm; discussion continued on Strategies, 8 am, 8/1/03.

- Extended discussion on need for clarity as to purpose and use of strategies, and how "community" is defined (All citizens in area? Interested constituents? Decision makers? Etc.)
- Suggested that 'socio-economic' issues be addressed by "How is the LE building support for the priority actions and priority areas in the strategy?" .
- Discussion how SRFB (not just LEs) should use strategies – suggestions for SRFB's objectives include:
 - Part of feedback loop to LEs;
 - To demonstrate increments of local progress; perhaps, SRFB to "reward" lists that fit well with local technical strategy.
 - To increase certainty that science and community values are used
 - To determine match between strategy and projects
 - To improve certainty of local priorities being understood by SRFB
 - To foster contributions from LEs to regional recovery plans
 - To evaluate strategies/projects contributing to recovery planning

Action Conclusion by ITF: Send out Attachment II, the model strategy outline, as a 'template', not a requirement to rewrite local strategies, ask LEs for comments.

Technical Panel:

Further discussions concerned the role of the SRFB Technical Panel:

- Need for a clear definition of purpose, role, responsibilities, and how they do their business. Need to avoid redundancy, perceived difficulty of responding to Panel issues, and provide consistency.
- Key function of Panel: provide SRFB with statewide perspective; only opportunity for consistent review of all proposals
- Key issue – show how LEs are promoting use of science and technical tools in their area
- Make sure technical prioritization process has opportunity to adjust ratings
- "Is project in a logical sequence, and is the technical approach sound?"
- Focus on the functions a review process needs to provide to SRFB, then address how to design a solution to fit those functions.
- Tech Panel functions to aid the SRFB by:
 - Help LEs progress relative to developing strategies
 - Provide independent, statewide science scrutiny
 - Provide consistent values across multiple lists. Help decide among many high-quality proposals.

Action Conclusion, ITF: LEs and past Tech Panel members will be sent a list of the functions that the Tech Panels have provided in past grant rounds. LEs and TP members will be asked to comment on these functions and suggest better ways to provide them.

Small Grant Program:

The ITF continued discussions of the NFWF proposal to expand their small grant program in Washington with SRFB matching funds.

Action Conclusion, ITF, regarding NFWF Small grants proposal: Staff will ask NFWF for a specific proposal by September 3, for not more than \$300,000 for use with at least two LEs to be identified (one outside of Puget Sound); reporting and review requirements so SRFB can determine later whether to continue or expand partnership with NFWF. ITF will review proposal in September to make recommendation to SRFB's Sept 24-25, 2003 meeting.

Next ITF Meeting:

September 11 and 12, 2003. Location to be announced, possible Port Angeles area or SeaTac.

Meeting adjourned about 2pm.